

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING D.		LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/918,823 08/01/2001		08/01/2001	Tomohiro Okumura	2001_1089A	4423	
513	7590	03/26/2004		EXAMINER		
	•	ID & PONACK, L	PHAN, T	PHAN, THO GIA		
2033 K STR SUITE 800	EET N. W	<i>7</i> .	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
WASHINGT	ON, DC	20006-1021	2821			

DATE MAILED: 03/26/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application	on No.	Applicant(s)	7
		09/918,82	3	OKUMURA ET AL.	
	Office Action Summary	Examiner		Art Unit	
		Tho G. Ph		2821	
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication apor Reply	opears on the	cover sheet with the	e correspondence addres	SS
THE - Exte after - If the - If NO - Failu - Any eam	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPI MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. e period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a re of period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period are to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stature reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no even ply within the statude will apply and will te, cause the apple.	ent, however, may a reply be utory minimum of thirty (30) of Il expire SIX (6) MONTHS fri ication to become ABANDO	timely filed days will be considered timely, om the mailing date of this common	unication.
Status					
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21				
2a)□	,—	his action is			
3)[Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice unde				ierits is
•	ion of Claims				-
4)⊠	Claim(s) 41-80 is/are pending in the applicat				
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra	awn from cor	nsideration.		
'=	Claim(s) is/are allowed.				
•	Claim(s) <u>41-80</u> is/are rejected.				
•	Claim(s) is/are objected to.				
•	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	or election re	equirement.	•	
	ion Papers				
,	The specification is objected to by the Examin		abianted to butba F	vominor	
10)[]	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc		•		
11)	Applicant may not request that any objection to the proposed drawing correction filed on				
,	If approved, corrected drawings are required in a			orovod by the Examinen	
12)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the E				
•	under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120				
•	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for forei	an priority un	der 35 U.S.C. & 119	9(a)-(d) or (f).	
-		gii pilonty an		(4) (4) (1)	
u,	1.⊠ Certified copies of the priority docume	nts have bee	n received.		
	2. Certified copies of the priority document			ation No.	
* (3. Copies of the certified copies of the pri application from the International E See the attached detailed Office action for a list	iority docume Bureau (PCT	ents have been rece Rule 17.2(a)).	ived in this National Sta	ge
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domes		·		nlication)
•	a) The translation of the foreign language p				piloation).
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for dome	•			
Attachmer	nt(s)				
2) Notic	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	<u>11/21/03</u> .		nary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). all Patent Application (PTO-19	

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 41-80 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 41-80 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's prior art figure 8 in view of Vo et al (6,603,269) [newly cited].

Applicant's prior art figure 8 discloses a plasma processing method comprising the step of introducing a gas into a vacuum chamber 1 through a hole 25 of a metal body 16 fixed to the vacuum chamber while exhausting from the vacuum chamber to keep the vacuum chamber within a specified pressure and applying high frequency power with a frequency to a plasma source provided so as to face a substrate 7 mounted on a substrate electrode 6 in the vacuum chamber to generate plasma in the vacuum chamber.

Applicant's prior art figure 8 has been discussed but fails to expressly teach a dielectric tube attached to a metal body fixed to the vacuum chamber, and the specific bands of operation as claimed. However, Vo et al in figure 1 disclose teaches a dielectric tube 14 attached to a metal body 13 fixed to the vacuum chamber 4. It would have been obvious

Application/Control Number: 09/918,823 Page 3

Art Unit: 2821

to one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the dielectric tube as taught by Vo et al for the purpose of passage of gases to be activated or excited and delivered to the processing into the chamber (see column 1, lines 30-36).

The specific bands of operation would have been obvious in the art. It would have been obvious to one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ a frequency ranging from 100KHz to 3GHz into Applicant's prior art figure 8 for the purpose of further improving to perform plasma processing of the substrate.

Conclusion

3. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The patents to Brown et al, Bjorkman et al, Wickramanayka, Morrow and Schultheiss et al are cited as of interested and illustrated a similar structure to a plasma processing system.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tho G. Phan whose telephone number is 571-272-1826. The examiner can normally be reached on (M-R), Monday-Thursday (7:30-6:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Don Wong can be reached on 571-272-1834. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 09/918,823 Page 4

Art Unit: 2821

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Tho G. Phan Primary Examiner Art Unit 2821